

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 5, 2008. With this Amendment claims 1, 21, 36 and 56 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Amendments

In this Amendment independent claims 1, 21, 36 and 56 are amended. In particular these claims are amended to more clearly indicate that the downloadable security file is neither used nor generated at the client device. Further, this clarifying amendment makes clear that the word using referred to the downloadable security profile generated externally, while the generating term refers to generating the downloadable security device at the client device. Support for these amendments can be found at least in the previous claims as well as the specification. No new matter is presented. Entry is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections under §102

In item 7 of the Office Action claims 1–3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,154,844 (hereinafter “Touboul”). The Applicant has reviewed the Touboul reference and must respectfully disagree.

In Item 4 of the Office Action the Examiner commented on the Applicant’s previous arguments presented in the paper filed on March 26, 2008. The Applicant wishes to comment on the Examiner’s understanding of the previous amendment. In particular the Examiner asserted that “Touboul ‘844 discloses that when a downloadable object does not include a downloadable security profile (DSP) generated by an external content inspection engine, the DSP is generated locally within the computer client, and a

trust level for the object is ascertained using the locally generated DSP” citing col. 5 lines 25–33 of Touboul. Further, the Examiner asserted that “[h]ence, Touboul discloses an embodiment wherein a trust level is accorded to an object without using a DSP generated by an external content engine or without generating a DSP by an external content inspection engine.” The Applicant has no argument with this assertion by the Examiner of what is disclosed and taught by Touboul. However, the Applicant would like to point out that this is not what is claimed in the claims.

In particular claim 1 as amended recites, “detecting an object associated with the web page at the client device, wherein the object does not include a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto; [and] assessing at the client device, as part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object without using the downloadable security profile or generating the downloadable security profile at the client device...” (amendments emphasized). In other words, claim 1 first recites that the detected object does not include a DSP that is generated by an external content engine. Next, claim 1 recites that the client device assesses which trust levels are to be accorded to the object. This is done without using or generating the DSP at the client device. It is important to note that the word “generating” appears in both features of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 accords a trust level(s) to the object without the use of a DSP regardless of where it is generated. In contrast, Touboul generates a DSP at the client device when the object lacks a DSP generated elsewhere. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Touboul reference does not disclose the features of claim 1 in its entirety. Thus, claim 1 is believed allowable over Touboul. Furthermore dependent claims 2 and 3 are believed allowable over Touboul, at least, based on their dependency from claim 1.

III. Rejections under §103

In item 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul. The Applicant notes that claim 4 is dependent from claim 1. For the reasons discussed above claim 4 is believed allowable over Touboul, at least, based on its dependency from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In item 13 of the Office Action claims 5–8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,207 (hereafter “Donohue”) and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0098883 (hereafter “Pennell”). The Applicant must respectfully disagree.

Claims 5–8 are dependent claims that depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above claim 1 is believed allowable over the Touboul reference. The addition of Donohue and Pennell do not remedy the identified deficiencies in claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claims 5–8 are allowable over the cited combination, at least, based on their dependency from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In item 19 of the Office Action claims 9–26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36–56 and 58–66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul in view of Pennell. The Applicant must respectfully disagree.

Of the rejected claims, claims 21, 36 and 56 are independent claims. Claims 21, 36 and 56 include features that are substantially similar to the features discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Therefore, the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to these claims. Further the addition of Pennell does not remedy the deficiencies identified in Touboul. Thus, independent claims 21, 36 and 56 are believed allowable over the cited combination. Dependent claims 9–20, 22–26, 28, 29, 31, 37–55 and 58–66 are believed allowable as well, at least, based on

their dependency from independent claims 1, 21, 36 or 56 respectively.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 22, 2008

By: /Nathan M. Rau/

Nathan M. Rau Reg. No.: 45,466
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-6882
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 22, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar